

Hon. Richard A. Jones

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

CHRISTERFER FRICK,

Defendant.

NO. 2:21-cr-00110-RAJ

ORDER ON DEFENDANT'S  
SECOND MOTION FOR  
REVIEW OF DETENTION  
ORDER

## I. INTRODUCTION

This matter comes before the Court upon Defendant Christerfer Frick's second motion seeking review of the Order of Detention entered on July 20, 2021, by Magistrate Judge S. Kate Vaughan pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3145(b). Dkt. 67. The government opposes the relief sought by the defendant. Dkt. 69. The defendant responded with a reply (Dkt. 72), the government responded with a surreply (Dkt. 79), the defendant responded with a surreply (Dkt. 82), the defendant provided an updated response to the government's surreply (Dkt. 87), and the government responded to the defendant's second surreply (89). Having thoroughly considered the parties' submissions and the relevant record, the Court finds oral argument unnecessary and hereby **DENIES** the defendant's motion.

## II. BACKGROUND

This Court previously issued an order on the defendant's original motion for review of the Order of Detention entered on July 20, 2021. Dkt. 26. That Order outlined

1 the history of this case and prior ruling of the Court and will not be repeated again. The  
2 defendant's current motion is focused upon his medical issues, namely his dental  
3 problems and Crohn's Disease. He renews his prior motion and alleges that his medical  
4 conditions require release so he can be treated by medical providers outside the FDC  
SeaTac.

### 5 **III. DISCUSSION**

6 In support of his motion, the defendant has provided updates of the treatment he  
7 has received at the FDC and his contentions that the treatment provided has been  
inadequate.

8 The defendant further contends that prejudice will result if his condition is not  
9 addressed before trial because his dental condition will impact his ability to participate in  
10 the trial and communicate if he testifies. The defendant further contends that his Crohn's  
11 Disease condition will necessitate his frequent visits to the restroom. The defendant  
included with his contention, medical records he believes demonstrates the absence of  
proper and reliable care. Dkts. 68, 73, and 83.

12 The government has provided this Court with supplemental medical records of the  
13 defendant. Dkt. 79. The government contends the records they supplied provide a more  
14 complete record of the treatment the defendant has received and will continue to receive.

15 Having reviewed the medical records provided by both parties, the Court  
16 concludes that Mr. Frick continues to receive appropriate medical treatment while at the  
FDC. The Court is not convinced with the record in existence that his medical issues  
17 cannot or will not be addressed while he is housed at the FDC.

18 The Court notes that it is undisputed that the government forwarded the  
19 defendant's motion to legal staff at FDC SeaTac who in turn alerted FDC medical staff to  
20 the defendant's claims of failed medical attention. As a result of this communication  
there is evidence before the Court that Mr. Frick was seen by a provider and steps were  
21 taken to adjust the medications provided to defendant to assist in managing his Crohn's  
Disease. Moreover, that same record indicates that medical tests and diagnostics will  
22 occur in the near future. It is also evidenced that the defendant has been scheduled for a

1 dental examination and that appropriate care will be provided thereafter. Dkt. 69. Under  
2 these facts, the Court is not persuaded that the defendant's medical issues will not be  
3 addressed at the FDC and his motion for release is denied.

#### 4 IV. CONCLUSION

5 This Court has already found that the defendant is both a flight risk and a danger  
6 to the community. The defendant has failed to present any other compelling evidence to  
7 warrant a change in that determination. The affirmation of the prior ruling of this Court  
8 is appropriate now as it was before. Rather than repeat what has already been noted by  
9 the Court's prior order, the Court directs the parties to the reasoning provided for  
10 detention in that Order. Dkt. 26.

11 For all of the foregoing reasons, the defendant's motion is **DENIED**.

12 DATED this 17th day of August, 2022.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Richard A. Jones", written over a horizontal line.

13 The Honorable Richard A. Jones  
14 United States District Judge  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22